

REMARKS

Claims 18, 19, and 22 to 33 were pending in the application at the time of examination. Claims 18, 19, and 22 to 33 stand rejected as anticipated. Claims 18, 19, and 22 to 33 stand provisionally rejected for obviousness-type double patenting.

Applicant has amended the specification to provide the current status of the non-provisional parent application and the serial numbers of the copending divisional applications.

Claims 18 and 27 recite a novel single hardware I/O block structure for both mirrored and non-mirrored transactions. As noted below, the prior art reference does not disclose a single hardware I/O block structure, but instead system commands that are sometimes referred to as "channel program commands" in the reference. To avoid a discussion on whether Applicant was requesting the Examiner to read limitations from the specification into the claims in interpreting what constituted a hardware I/O block structure, Applicant has amended Claims 18 and 27 to recite an inherent feature of such structures.

Claims 18, 19, and 22 to 33 stand rejected under 25 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,155,845, hereinafter referred to as "Beal." In the rejection, the Examiner cited to Fig. 17 and the use of the structure in Fig. 17 in an extended dual copy feature and an extended connectivity feature of Beal.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of Claims 18 and 27. The structure cited by the Examiner is used to configure a data storage control unit and a pair of volumes so that subsequent standard write commands function properly. Specifically, Beal stated:

DSC 105 interprets the reception of the commands and information of FIGS. 14-17 as being a request from the host to prepare itself for the provision of extended dual copy service to a pair of specified volumes when the

above-described standard DASD channel commands are subsequently received requesting the writing of a data record to the locally specified volume of DSC 105. (Emphasis added.)

Beal, Col. 19, lines 61 to 68. Thus, Beal explicitly teaches that the commands cited by the Examiner are used to configure "DSC 105" and it is subsequent standard DASD channel commands that request writing of data. The same is true for the Extended Connectivity Service.

The structure relied upon by the Examiner is not a hardware I/O command block structure as recited in Claims 18 and 27. In fact with the prior art, two different command sequences, a command sequence to configure DSC 105 and a subsequent standard DASD channel command, are needed to accomplish a write. In contrast, all this information is conveyed in the single hardware I/O command block structure as recited in Claims 18 and 27. Thus, Beal not only fails to teach exactly what is claimed, but teaches away from the structure recited in Claims 18 and 27. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 18 and 27.

Claims 19 and 22 to 26 depend from Claim 18 and so distinguish over Beal for at least the same reasons as Claim 18. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 19 and 22 to 26.

Claims 28 to 33 depend from Claim 27 and so distinguish over Beal for at least the same reasons as Claim 27. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 28 to 33.

Claims 18, 22 to 27, and 29 to 33 stand provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 27 to 32 of copending U.S. Patent Application 10/779,416. Enclosed herewith is a Terminal Disclaimer and the appropriate fee.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness-type double patenting rejection of each of Claims 18, 22 to 27, and 29 to 33 in view of Claims 27 to 32 of copending U.S. Patent Application 10/779,416.

Claims 18, 19 and 22 to 33 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1 to 3, 7, 8 and 17 of U.S. Patent No. 6,728,791 in view of Beal. Enclosed herewith are a Terminal Disclaimer and the appropriate fee. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness-type double patenting rejection of each of Claims 18, 22 to 33 over Claims 1 to 3, 7, 8 and 17 of U.S. Patent No. 6,728,791 in view of Beal.

Claims 18, 19 and 22 to 33 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1 to 3, 7, 8 and 17 of U.S. Patent No. 6,701,385 in view of Beal. Enclosed herewith are a Terminal Disclaimer and the appropriate fee. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness-type double patenting rejection of each of Claims 18, 22 to 33 over Claims 1 to 3, 7, 8 and 17 of U.S. Patent No. 6,701,385 in view of Beal.

//  
//  
//  
//  
//  
//  
//  
//  
//  
//  
//  
//  
//

Appl. No. 10/779,417

Amdt. dated February 14, 2005

Reply to Office Action of November 17, 2004

Claims 18, 19, and 22 to 33 remain in the application. Claims 18 and 27 have been amended. Claims 1 to 17, 20 and 21 were previously canceled. For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of all pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions relating to the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned Attorney for Applicant(s).

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on February 14, 2005.



Attorney for Applicant(s)

February 14, 2005  
Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



Forrest Gunnison  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 32,899  
Tel.: (831) 655-0880